

**FATAL ERRORS  
OF MARXISM  
AND THE  
PROBLEMS  
OF MODERN  
DEMOCRACY**



VICTOR MIKHOL

**FATAL ERRORS  
OF MARXISM  
AND THE  
PROBLEMS  
OF MODERN  
DEMOCRACY**

**FATAL ERRORS  
OF MARXISM  
AND THE  
PROBLEMS  
OF MODERN  
DEMOCRACY**

VICTOR MIKHOL



Charleston, SC  
[www.PalmettoPublishing.com](http://www.PalmettoPublishing.com)

**Fatal Errors of Marxism and the Problems of Modern Democracy**

Copyright © 2021 by Victor Mikhoh

All rights reserved.

No portion of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or other—except for brief quotations in printed reviews, without prior permission of the author.

Paperback ISBN: 978-1-64990-603-8  
ISBN: 979-8-21822-768-5 (e-book)

# CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

II. MARXISM THROUGH THE EYES OF A SOVIET ENGINEER

III. MAIN FALLACIES OF MARXISM

IV. PROBLEM OF DEMOCRACY

# I.

## INTRODUCTION.

I came to the USA after the collapse of the USSR, which happened shortly after the predatory privatization of state property. In the newly formed republics, harmful socialist habits proved to be very strong, which led to rampant criminalization, theft, nationalism, corruption, etc. People were completely at a loss, and during the very first elections, a significant number of them voted for the old communist leaders, which, as they remembered, could provide at least some order.

The transition of power to many old acquaintances testified only that one should not expect any changes for the better in the near future. This was understandable to many who wanted to move somewhere, wherever there was nothing reminiscent of socialism, except for social protection. I was happy to end up in such a country - the USA. I dreamed of visiting this country from a young age when I became completely disappointed in the Marxist idea. I knew that the Communist Party, which had ruined the lives of hundreds of millions of people, was banned in America. I hoped that even in the worst nightmare I would no longer think about Marxism. However, now I have to.

When in this country, which I had fallen in love with, I saw and heard the worst version of the Marxism rhetoric performed by local left-wing democrats, I realized that I had buried the damned teaching too soon. I was struck by the fact mentioned in an article that the experts of the Open Syllabus Project (2016) studied the programs of universities in the USA, Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand and found out that the “Communist Manifesto” of Marx and Engels closes the top three most studied

books in the universities of these countries. The very same work was in the first place among books used for the study assignments for American students in such states as Washington, Wisconsin, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Indiana.

History, as usual, does not teach anything even with its latest examples. Then I had decided, hoping it could help somehow, to present the results of decades of my experience in analyzing communist theory, as well as the problems of modern democracy associated with it.

## II.

# MARXISM THROUGH THE EYES OF A SOVIET ENGINEER.

*“The Marxist doctrine is omnipotent because it is true. It is comprehensive and harmonious and provides men with an integral world outlook irreconcilable with any form of superstition, reaction, or defense of bourgeois oppression. It is the legitimate successor to the best that man produced in the nineteenth century, as represented by German philosophy, English political economy, and French socialism.”*

I cited the beginning of V. Lenin’s article “The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism” popular among the Communists (and not only among them), which allows forming an opinion about this doctrine without delving into the gory details of Marx’s “Capital” and other primary sources of the founders of Marxism. I had to do this in the early 70s of the last century. I was a student at a technical university. A very large part of the study time, that we needed so much, was assigned to the study of the foundations of Marxism — Leninism, which we hated. The reason for the hate was simple - many of us felt that the backwardness of the USSR was directly related to these foundations. Discussions of these problems were dangerous. In humanitarian universities, even more time was allotted to Marxism, but the attitude towards it was also somewhat different. There It was understood that for many of them this is the basis for future career growth. The more often one would refer to the mainline of the Communist Party, the more direct and faster will be one’s rise to its leading echelons. And if you have any connections in those places, the success is guaranteed. Intelligence is not important - loyalty is one of the main principles of the communist (and not only) dictatorship.



Returning to the technical education, I would like to be understood correctly - I want an engineer to have a broad enough worldview, which is connected with the philosophical perception of the world. But when you are forced to study only the Marxist views as the only true ones, you begin to wonder about others, but the access to them was sharply limited. Any dissent was brutally punished. If you, in a circle of acquaintances, told a joke about someone from the party elite, and someone reported about it, the simple chain "KGB - a prison term" was assured. A prison term for political reasons could be quite long. Although the GULAG, it seems, was no longer there, the eternal KGB had no problem finding a suitable location. The country was completely isolated from any influence from outside. The Iron Curtain stretched over many years, ensured the purity of the communist experiment. There was 100% certainty that during the years of Soviet power the line of the Communist Party was built according to the standards of Marxism. At the same time, people's living standards remained incomparably lower than in the West. This was eloquently echoed by the empty shelves of the grocery stores and multi-hour lines in them when chicken, cheese, sausages, etc. would appear. Clothing and footwear stores sold domestic goods that people were embarrassed to wear. They tried to find something imported paying large premiums to the speculators. A common occurrence was families huddling in the small rooms of communal apartments i.e. the apartments with shared kitchens and toilets. The latter could be primitive and outdoor. Many household appliances, common in Europe, were either difficult to acquire or not known at all. We envied people living abroad and the party elite, who had access to special stores with goods inaccessible to us. This top tier, starting with local authorities and ending, as they were called, party-government, also had its hospitals, sanatoriums, etc. Similar privileges were enjoyed by the leaders of law enforcement agencies, who protected the system.

If, as mentioned above, the USSR was built exactly according to the rules of Marxism, then they do not work! Let us recite the beginning of Lenin's article: "The Marxist doctrine is omnipotent because it is true."

And if it is wrong, then ...? In vain were the rivers of blood spilled for its victory in the USSR and in other countries that have embarked on the socialist path of development. Millions of people who believed in it, almost like in a new religion, promising

paradise, although in the future, but during the lifetime, were deceived, which, in general, is characteristic for many religions along with the bloodshed. Even now, consciously or not, it serves as the basis of the left-liberal democracy of the West.

### III.

## THE MAIN FALLACIES OF MARXISM.

To prove the fundamental fallacy of this teaching, let us turn again to the Lenin's article.

Let's agree that Marxism is based on three main parts: German classical philosophy, the British economy, and French socialism. Consider them one at a time, but in a slightly changed order, especially since according to Marxism, philosophy is a superstructure on an economic basis.

### 1. ECONOMY.

Let's not analyze here all the details of the commodity-money chain, sufficiently described by British economists, for example, J.Locke , before Marx. Let's consider only its production side. For Marx, this is a particularly important point in the construction of his doctrine. It is intended for assimilation by the popular masses. Since Marx himself treats them without much of the respect, he spends many of pages of his "Capital" to chew on it, so that the masses would finally understand at least something. I have a better opinion of my readers, and I will be shorter.

The process of production of any goods involves an organizational unit, raw materials purchased for processing, technological equipment, and labor.

Let's denote them in the order they were mentioned: OU, RM,

TE, L. We will take into account that during Marx lifetime the concept of the last component of the process included mainly workers or the proletariat, which we will denote as P. It was assumed that P would be the main beneficiary of Marxism. Hence his main slogan: "Proletarians of all countries unite!", as well as the name of the ideal state - dictatorship (not a democracy!) of P. In the modern world, the concept of the labor changes significantly. The white-collar workers performing intellectual tasks are playing an increasingly important role, which significantly changes sociology, but, in general, the components remain the same.

Each of the components has its monetary value. At the same time, equipment wear during the manufacturing process is called amortization expense - AE. These expenses form the total production cost of the product - PC.

$PC = OU + RM + AE + L$  is a general equation that shows the economic components of the process. Let's, like Marx, discuss in greater detail OU and L. It is OU that determines the nature of the means of production ownership. Under capitalism, it is mainly private. I will not dwell into the details of the necessary additional costs, such as transportation, product advertising, and retail. There is no fundamental difference in both systems here other than advertising for private production is more expensive.

So, with a successful organization of production and with the correct assessment of the retail market, a capitalist (or company of owners) will receive larger or smaller profit. Over a sufficiently long period, the values of OU, RM, and AE can be considered to be constant. That is, the value of profit changes mainly depend on the costs of L or salaries and other worker-related expenses, which depend on the labor market, where L is a product whose value is determined by the number of offers on the one hand and the minimum, if established (by law or union requirements), salary. If the capitalist-employer hires workers for the amount of money that corresponds to the labor costs of the operations performed, there would be no profit, and entrepreneurship would lose its main driver.

Naturally, the capitalist tries to pay as little as possible considering the labor market and realizing that the labor cost as a concept is not directly related to the time spent at work. For

example, with a good OU, 10 people can complete the same amount work as 20 when the OU is not as good. So, the labor productivity is 2 times greater and, accordingly, the profit increases. Of course, with increasing productivity, the burden on workers intensifies, the size of which is stipulated in the agreement. The difference between the cost of labor and the paid wages is called the surplus value (SV), which is especially emphasized in the “Capital” as a means of predatory exploitation of the proletariat by the capitalist. It was assumed, that under the socialist ownership, i.e. state ownership of the enterprise, such exploitation would not exist.

And it does not. But here is what exists instead. I describe my relatively recent impressions of an American government agency. Agreed that it is not a production enterprise, but there is no fundamental difference in the organization of work. Imagine hundreds of people standing in line in front of and inside of the Los Angeles Immigration and Naturalization Services building. They should be served by a group of employees of the Service. These are mainly women who are slow to start and who fulfill their duties slowly, constantly distracted by talking, drinking coffee, stepping out somewhere, etc. No one and nothing can make them work faster. They know very well how difficult it is to fire a person from public service, and if you are also a member of a minority, the reason for the termination is, of course, racism. When I filled the documents for leaving the USSR (I could no longer endure the socialist nightmare), everything was performed the same. The state-owned OUs work in the same manner everywhere, only the earnings under Socialism are incomparably lower at all enterprises, including industry.

And this is understandable. The principle of regulation of wages in a state-run OU is based on their planned average values for certain administrative regions. These average values determined by the regional management with the approval from the central financial authorities. Thus, the money reaches the recipient through a cumbersome chain of coordination links, and each link requests its share. As a result, the salary of a worker is much lower compared to the similar sectors of the capitalist countries.

Means for increasing labor productivity go through almost the same coordination chain of authorities, who do not have their interest in the result, which leads to a significant slowdown in technological progress.

To confirm the statements above, I will refer to my experience as an engineer for equipment renovation at one of the plants of the USSR. By the beginning of the year, we would prepare a working draft of a request for the equipment necessary for the plant, approved by the director, which would be enough for submitting an order at a private enterprise. But we had to submit the draft of the request to Moscow, to the **ministry** of our industry for review, from where, after some time, it was transferred to the supply department of industrial enterprises. Toward the end of the year, representatives of many plants, such as myself, were called in this department for additional approvals of the requests. I will not describe the nightmare that reigned in the corridors of the department, where hundreds of people crowded in lines to the offices or editing masses of application documents after visiting them.

Further, these documents were sent to the equipment manufacturers. The latter, in turn, had to receive approvals for the list of the necessary materials and delivery plans in their ministry.

Thus, the time from creating the equipment order to equipment delivery to the customer was stretched for 5-6 years. During this period, the equipment would become morally and technically obsolete, which naturally led to a relative decrease in its productivity.

From the foregoing, it follows that with the state-run OUs the employee's salary and productivity are much lower than with the capitalist ones. At the same time, the longer the chain from the enterprise to the branch **ministry (center of the government)**, the greater the difference, and the dependence more likely follows the power-law than proportionality. In other words, the notorious Marxist surplus-value, that is received by the owner of the enterprise, is much smaller than the government spending on the same production, and the wages of workers in a private enterprise are much higher because of it.

By now many people have understood purely practically that private ownership of the means of production is much more effective than state ownership (I do not count socialist fanatics). My goal was to prove this theoretically in Marx's terms and to show the fallacy of his economic approach, verified by the practice in the USSR.

I want to draw your attention to another characteristic feature of the “national” ownership of enterprises. I recall the words of an enthusiastic Soviet song, well known in my young years: “... and everything around belongs to the people, and everything around belongs me!”. Most production workers pretended to understand these words literally and took what was theirs, meaning they simply stole everything that was not guarded well. At the same time, the state, in their mind, seemed to be some remote abstract. Of course, there were honest people, especially in the places where there was nothing to steal, for example, teachers or engineers, and they were made fun of in this regard. During my career, I changed my jobs a sufficient amount of times to confirm to myself that theft from a place of work was a universal system.

Here is another example from my work experience. I was hired as a power equipment engineer at a confectionery factory. After some time, the management decided that I could be trusted, which meant that I could regularly receive my portion of products, which were used as ingredients at the factory production line and were in deficit in regular grocery stores (yes, this is normal under Socialism), such as eggs, butter, etc. These products were diverted from the production, and as result quality could not but suffer. But the buyers should not be pampered! Of course, we knew that the ingredients were not only diverted to the factory employees. A significant part of it served as the bribes to the **party and economy** leadership of the district, to the state technical inspectors, etc. ( Here and later on it doesn't make sense to mention the name of party. In USSR it was only one legitimate Communist party ). Even if you didn't want to steal, you still had to. The system would force you to.

How? The equipment of the factory, which was under my control, was rather worn out, especially the parts of the plumbing system. According to the maintenance plan (I still don't know who and when had created it up at the **ministry**), the factory annually allocated funds for the amount which we had used to coordinate the purchase of the necessary equipment from reserves that our **Gossnab** branch could offer to us. Because our factory was small compared to the defense engineering giants of the city, which were receiving all supplies in the first place, we only would get the remnants nobody else wanted. We had to take them, otherwise, the funds available to us for the next year would be reduced.

I had two choices. The first one, not very reliable, was to try to trade what I needed with what I had and what could be useful to the poor colleagues of mine at other factories of our scale. More often I used the second choice. I would collect our factory sweet products in a large briefcase and, at the risk of being arrested right at its gates, headed to the city department of the **Gossnab**. There, an employee, happy with the bribe, would transfer the items we needed to our account from the account of a large enterprise, where this withdrawal most likely will not be noticed.

It looked disgusting, like any theft and bribery. But the system did not leave any choice. It didn't care what you stole for. You just understood that it was impossible to buy the right part on the open market with strictly planned socialist ownership, and without this part, for example, without an operational gas supply regulator, the steam boiler will explode or the factory will stop. All of your bosses knew about it and if you couldn't get something or if you couldn't bribe someone, then you were not doing the job well. Before achieving their positions, they had already gone through all this. If you find yourself in a leadership position, then you understand the rules of the game. The higher the level of leadership, the greater the amount of finance and goods were spinning in the field of corruption and more dirty money was settling in their pockets. Therefore, the ability to "get" was valued much higher than simply buying the required things.

Therefore, Socialism, built according to the rules of Marxism, is not only economically inefficient, it, on the one hand, morally degrades a person (in my opinion, this is the worst legacy of "triumphant" Socialism), and, it also destroys person's ability to do business. Among emigrants from the USSR, I met a lot of capable people, who held high posts in their homeland but could not adapt to the normal business practices without theft and corruption.

Those **party and economy** leaders of different levels, who remained in the republics after the collapse of the Soviet Union, became major holders of assets obtained through corruption. Using these assets, they bought the vouchers, distributed among the people, for ownership of parts of state-owned industrial and agricultural enterprises, and became their owners. Since they did not have the entrepreneurship skills, and the old state ties were cut off, the economies of most of the new republics were in decline. Inflation arose everywhere, as a result of which the money received



from the sale of vouchers depreciated, and people were left with nothing.

If someone remembers, the Bolsheviks-Marxists seized the power in 1917 under the slogan: “Factories to workers, land to peasants, peace to nations!” Industrial enterprises were initially run by officials of the party-government nomenclature, who ultimately privatized them. Agriculture, consisting of collective farms, state farms, and agricultural machinery stations, was managed by the **party and economic bodies** distributed from district to **ministry** levels, after the termination of these ties, also faced problems of unorganized privatization. First of all, it was the absence of qualified farmers who could act diversified and within the necessary scope. The owners of this level were exiled and killed in the 20s-30s during the terrible period of collectivization. Secondly, there were no clear plans for the distribution of land and machinery, which, of course, was eventually stolen. Young people mostly left the villages, not finding any opportunities for themselves there. As a result, having the richest land resources, the post-Soviet countries were forced to import food products. Such was the end of the largest in the history Marxist scam with “people’s property.”

“Peace to nations” turned out to be another lie of the communists, because their plans always included seizing power around the world to establish their regimes (see, for example, “Icebreaker” by V. Suvorov).

To complete the comparison of the efficiencies of natural for personal private property and Marxist national or state property, I will add more recent observations. The European countries that entered the socialist camp as a result of World War II, as well as the Baltic republics of the USSR, quickly restored their economies after the USSR collapse based on their sense of a private property that they had not yet forgotten. The people of those republics that were originally part of the Soviet Union had become so accustomed to the centralized system of governance and subordination, that their old leadership, easily adjusted to democratic templates, had no problem to establish varieties of authoritarian-oligarchic regimes by slightly changing the forms of power and protecting it with police and gang units, under which the scale of bureaucratic corruption has grown even more amid the economic decline. This is the natural result of socialism, which triumphed not only in the country but also in the brains of its citizens.

## 2. PHILOSOPHY.

The philosophy of Marxism - dialectical materialism is based on a combination of Hegel's dialectical idealism and Feuerbach's materialism. It is mainly developed by F. Engels. This teaching suggests that materialism and atheism are the most important for the proletariat, which has to fight for its interests in the future on Earth, without being distracted by the religious promises of heaven. At the same time, Hegelian dialectics gave the needed dynamics to materialism, static until then, built on obvious empirical facts.

The main feature of Marxist philosophy that differentiates it from the other philosophy schools, is the intolerance towards them. Therefore, as soon as it received the state status after the 1917 coup, any dissent, i.e. school of thought not based on Marxism, became brutally punished. One of the most shameful pages in the history of the new government was the mass expulsion of the intelligentsia, in some ways disagreeing with Marxism, in 1922. This event is known as the "ship of philosophers" because some of the expelled scientists were famous philosophers such as N.A. Berdyaev, I.A. Ilyin, I.I. Lapshin etc. The expulsion were carried out not only by two German ships but also by trains. It should be noted that this was not the worst option for the deportees. Their friends and other people, who shared their views and stated in Russia, were subsequently either executed or died in prisons. This was the elimination of the intellectual elite of the RSFSR, from which even genetically is too difficult to recover.

As for the dispute between the **champions** of Marxist materialism and the idealism of other philosophical trends, which continues to this day, I am not a supporter of either one or the other. I am not a materialist, but I do not hold any reverence for the religions of the West. Their empty theological disputes, the bloody struggles of the past for a larger number of flocks, and, consequently, money, are no better than the unsavory international politics. I am sure that only the faith, based on individual conscious choices, can unite people who are now divided by the myths of different religions. But this is a subject for a separate serious discussion.

## 3. FRENCH SOCIALISM.

Here, speaking of socialism, Lenin means not the political regime of the USSR, I have mentioned before, which is characterized by the prohibition of the private ownership of the means of production in industry and agriculture, but the political forces aimed to install the regime.

Why the French socialism was chosen is evident from the Engels preface to the 3rd German edition of 1885 of Marx's article "The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte", which refers to the final chords of the French revolution: "France is a country in which historical class struggle reached a decisive end each time more so than in other countries. In France, in the sharpest outlines, those changing political forms were forged in which this class struggle occurred."

Marxism considers the history of mankind as a sequence of changes in the types of class struggle. The primitive tribal period, the modified features of which can still be observed, immediately falls out from this approach. However, the struggle of slaves for their freedom against slaveholders, the struggle of peasants and bourgeoisie with the feudal lords for land and civil rights fit well into this classification, and, finally, what doctrine leads to the inevitable revolutionary struggle of the proletariat with capitalists for the means of production.

How the last type of struggle had ended we saw in the economy section of this article. Such an approach to history is not very legitimate, but it is quite characteristic of a Marxist obsession with the revolutionary struggle (which is usual now for most people in the age of romantic youth). In a kaleidoscope of events of the French revolutions, beginning with the Great Revolution of 1789, at times conflicting layers of society, including capitalists and workers, appearing on the same side of the barricades because for **both all of them** the common enemies were allied monarchies and large financiers. Therefore, I am more impressed by the approach to the revolutionary struggle of Thomas Carlyle, one of the contemporary of those events: "Romantics conceive every revolution, fanatics carry it out, and villains use its fruit." It sounds, of course, great, but it is not entirely accurate.

The revolution explodes when unbearable political and economic conditions arise in a given country. For example, the prerequisites for the events of 1789 were the crisis of the absolute

monarchy in France, the contradictions between the emerging new capitalist relations and feudalism, which maintained the positions of power, the demands of the bourgeoisie to expand its political rights, the sharp deterioration of the economy in connection with problems in agriculture associated with natural disasters, as well as high unemployment, empty treasury, etc.

As for the “romantics,” then yes, in the works of such enlighteners as Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau, the ideas of a new state structure incompatible with the monarchism were already ripe and widely spread in the educated circles, but they certainly were not the strategists of the revolution. Another thing is that the enthusiastic and romantic reflection of revolutionary events on the canvases of great artists (E. Delacroix “Freedom Leading the People”), in the words of writers (V. Hugo “Les Miserables”), as well as direct calls for an uprising against tsarism in Russia from its famous poets ( A.S. Pushkin. “In-Depth of the Siberian Ores”) could not but find a response in the souls of people of various classes and social strata. Even now, although I am more likely to associate the revolution with the sea of blood, I feel some kind of excitement, reciting the words of Pushkin that I learned at school more than 60 years ago:

*“The fetters will fall down, then  
The dungeons will be ruined - Freedom  
Will meet you at the entrance step  
And brothers sword will give for the indigent.”*

But this is me. It is hard to imagine how many people, especially young people, are still seriously infected with the romance of the revolution, which is spontaneously combined with dissatisfaction with the society in which they live. Remember how many young men were proud of the portrait of a Cuban mercenary Che Guevara on their T-shirts, considering him a true revolutionary. Many of the university professors, obsessed with their sciences, and therefore divorced from life’s realities, drive “progressive” socialist ideas into the heads of their students, once taken up by them in their youth and actively supported by liberal propaganda. I mentioned the Open Syllabus Project in the introduction.

Unfortunately, there are still too many revolutionary fanatics who seriously believe in the realm of freedom and universal justice

on Earth, which is separated from reality only by some number of victims on the next barricade. It is characteristic that such kinds of “fighters for the happiness of the people” don’t value individual human lives for a penny, which makes them very related to villains who achieve their goal at any cost.

Speaking of villains. Returning to the Carlyle paradox, I want to clarify one thing. The revolution, which began in 1789, ended feudalism and significantly expanded the rights of the bourgeoisie, including the electoral rights, as well as the rights of other classes of the nation who rebelled against the absolute monarchy. Over the next ten years of revolutionary transformations, the nature of power has changed significantly. There is no way to chronologically list here those parties and groups that ended up in power at different times. Calling them all “villains” would not be very correct. Each of them, defending their interests and ideas, striving for a majority in the government, often without disdain to dubious methods. However, the period of 1793-1794 required extraordinary measures to protect the Republic from external enemies and internal counter-revolution, especially during the time of Jacobin terror, when the Committee for Public Safety appointed by the Convention was under influence of Robespierre. Thousands of Frenchmen were guillotined or executed in other ways. The guilt of many of them is historically dubious. For the Jacobins, the fight against counter-revolution justified any sacrifice. Was there any other option for self-preservation at the disposal of the Republic? Reading Carlyle’s “Guillotine”, written as almost a documentary in the wake of these tragic events, it’s obvious that radicals like Robespierre could not offer anything else to desperate people. But, starting with the execution of Louis XVI, the whole development of these events looked like a continuous chain of executions. And it seems to me that if the level of “villains” is measured by the degree of revolutionary fanaticism, the subsequent execution of Robespierre himself by the guillotine seems quite logical.

It is also possible that Carlyle had in mind the July Revolution of 1830, when the workers, along with the liberal bourgeoisie, were on one side of the barricades. But the fruits of their victory went to the bourgeoisie adventurers in alliance with its other types. But, perhaps, the thesis about “villains” manifested itself most clearly after the victory of the Bolsheviks in the USSR. I have already mentioned this, describing the disparate advantages of the life of the party and government elite in comparison with the same

proletariat, whose interests they so “cared” for.

By literally accepting the revolutionary doctrine of Marx, based on the analysis of “French socialism”, and considering the actions of the Jacobins to be much more legitimate than the actions of moderate Girondins, Lenin and his comrades staged the October coup of 1917, which grew into a civil war with millions of victims. The similarity of the scenarios of both revolutions is obvious. For Jacobins and Bolsheviks, the fight against counter-revolution, often paranoid in appearance, justified the cruelest means. The Extraordinary Commission, which later became the KGB, during the entire period of the Soviet regime, especially under Stalin, under this pretext prosecuted the slightest dissent or suspicion of it - millions were executed or died in exile (recall the GULAG).

Not only the USSR, but also other countries that took the path of socialism, exiled and destroyed, without any restrictions, millions of their people for any deviation from the ruling party line, determined by the next “people’s” dictator, for example, Mao in China, Pol Pot in Kampuchea, Kim Jong-Un in the DPRK, Mobutu in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (Zaire), and finally Maduro in Venezuela. All of these countries were certainly democratic and, except for China recently, lived in poverty. China was in the same position until it moved away from socialism and revived private property rights.

In other words, the socialist democracies, that today’s “leftists” are ardent supporters, are usually one step away from a dictatorship or authoritarian. Justifying the harmful consequences of the rule of former and existing quasi-socialist regimes, the same “leftists” insisting that the problem was in the correctable wrong selection of the leadership personnel. The examples of countries, that we have cited, show that the roots of future criminal dictatorships are laid already with the formation of States of this type, and the degree of crime is determined by those villains (remember Carlyle) who have reached power by eliminating (often physically) their fellow rivals. Naturally, the cruelest and vilest of them reach the very top.

Having considered the theoretical errors of Marxism in connection with the above-mentioned Lenin’s article, it is necessary to point out another extremely important one. In the “Capital”, in particular, *the behavior of the popular masses is identified as*

*fundamental instead of studying the psychology and the individual qualities of their constituents.* We will discuss this issue in more detail in the next related section.

## IV.

# THE PROBLEM OF DEMOCRACY.

**I**t is no accident that I use the term “democracy” here without any of the exalted meaning that is usually attached to it. For me, it sounds quite natural in the name of one of the world’s poorest countries - Democratic Republic Congo. The political crisis that the previously powerful countries of the so-called Western Democracy, including the United States, are experiencing right now is directly related to what was originally laid down in this concept. That’s why W. Churchill had every right to say: “Democracy is the worst form of government, except for all the others that humanity has tried.” Unfortunately, this thought rarely occurs to those who think that membership in the Democratic party automatically guarantees a role worthy of respect.

The basic principles of modern Western democracy, which its representatives enthusiastically advertise and try to implant everywhere, without thinking about how it suits someone’s existing way of life, remain the same as those taken from French socialism - the third component of Marxism.

Let’s take a closer look at them, despite their apparent simplicity. Since the time of the French revolution, the national code of arms of France has been emblazoned with the universally recognized motto of the democracy: “Freedom, Equality, Fraternity”. How many people remember today that these words were first uttered in Robespierre’s speech “About the organization of the National Guard” on December 5, 1790? Yes, yes, the one who was executed later for violent social radicalism, so natural for modern left-wing Democrats.



The Declaration of Human and Civil Rights of 1791 gives an interpretation of the first two terms:

1. Freedom consists in the right to do anything that does not harm another.
2. Equality means that all citizens are equal BEFORE it (the LAW) and therefore have equal access to all positions, public offices, and occupations according to THEIR ABILITIES and without any differences other than those provided to their virtues and abilities.
3. The fraternity was defined in the Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man and the Citizen in 1795 in the following form: “do not do to others what you would not like to be done to yourself, do to others such good deeds as you would like to be done yourself.”

The third formulation is very similar to religious commandments. You know very well how they are followed in reality. For me, it sounds somewhat mocking, because it appeared after the execution of the one who first used this word among the three basic features of democracy, has repeatedly violated the commandment: “Thou shalt not kill!” Fratricide is common in civil wars, and often not in a figurative sense. Unfortunately, the examples of hatred in human society are far more frequent than the individual cases of fraternity. The latter is more often remembered in association with monks, brothers in misfortune, or groups often created with criminal intent.

“Freedom “ and “Equality” are much more interesting as the symbols of democracy.

## 1. “FREEDOM OF A PERSON” AS A CONCEPT AND ITS REPRESENTATION IN THE RIGHTS OF A CITIZEN.

One can ask: what may not be clear here? Everyone knows that freedom is something beautiful that is worth one’s life to fight for. Those who do not think so are almost enemies of humanity and the progress. Freedom in this sense is difficult to imagine better than in the form of a half-naked girl, the central figure of the above-mentioned painting of E. Delacroix. Thanks to the genius of the

artist, this image is forever imprinted in the hearts of millions, without any doubt that this is what the desired freedom looks like. However, someone, especially men, may have doubts about where such a frivolous-looking lady can lead people.

Let's now strip freedom of its romantic aura and try once again to understand what does it mean for a person in the modern world. Slavery, as such, is a thing of the past, except for some specific cases, which are persecuted by law. Therefore, now the demand for freedom for a person, in general, is nothing more than an attempt to realize the vague romantics' idea. The mentioned above definition from the Declaration of 1791 is not very successful. It might be ideal only for hermits.

First, let's determine who really needs freedom now. First of all, the inmates in prisons. Another thing is that they might be imprisoned unjustly, but this is a question to the legal system of this country, which cannot always be influenced by international laws.

The following groups of people could be considered as not free:

- a.those who are living on the occupied territories,
- b.those who are deprived of the right to leave their country (for example, the former USSR, North Korea),
- c.those who are living in colonies, that almost do not exist anymore.

For them, the struggle for freedom has a certain meaning.

Individual slavery is widespread among women in Muslim families. As W. Churchill wrote in his book "War on the river. The story of the liberation of Sudan", 1902: "The fact that, according to the Muslim law, every woman belongs to a man as his absolute property - and it does not matter whether she is a child, a wife, or a concubine - this fact undoubtedly delays the moment of the disappearance of slavery."

As long as these families live in Islamic countries, the imposition of Western democratic laws that deny any form of slavery is

completely meaningless, since it contradicts the Sharia laws that allow it, which are followed by the same women. At best, some recommendations for a different lifestyle might be acceptable.

It is much worse when the families, that are governed by the Islamic traditions, end up in the Western world, especially in such numbers it's happening now. Left-wing Democrats use a rather artificial term to justify the growing Muslim expansion in Europe and the United States - MULTICULTURALISM, which may be suitable for cultures of a similar level. In fact, in the case of Islam, an organic part of which is the " Jihad of the Sword "(more on this below), which is essentially a military doctrine aimed at fighting against "infidels" to the point of eliminating those who do not want to accept Islam, this is a deadly WAR of CULTURES from different civilizations. The obvious way to avoid it is to restrict the migration of Muslims to the Western countries and to impose the requirement (with an oath on the Koran!) for their compliance with the norms of life in these countries. We have to admit that the victory of the militant Islam over the relaxed and socially pampered liberal Europe is even more real today than at the time when Churchill wrote in the above-mentioned book: "There is no force on earth more reactionary than this. Islam is a militant and proselytizing faith that is still very far from its sunset... and if Christianity had not been protected by the progress of science ... the modern European civilization might have fallen, as the civilization of ancient Rome did."

The historical parallels that characterize the demise of former empires largely coincide. Well, at least the different levels of civilizational development in Arab and European countries, the rapid growth of the number of people of non-traditional orientations and their influence in European countries, the huge difference in the birth rate between Muslims and Europeans. So, the long-term struggle of Western women for their equality and independence, even to the point of demanding special rights, may well end in their slavish following the master while wearing the hijab.

This was all about the concept of "a free person", but the word "freedom" itself, used in defining the civil rights of this person, is demagogically replaced by its general concept. This refers to such categories as freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly and demonstration, etc., the completeness of which is

determined by the laws and the Constitution of the country concerned. The imperfection of these laws usually makes it possible to interpret them in someone's interests. This is particularly evident in the distortion of the concepts of freedom of speech and religion.

## RESTRICTION OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH. POLITICAL CORRECTNESS.

Now the freedom of speech, for example in the United States, is almost a one-sided concept. An overwhelming number of media outlets impose their interpretation on citizens in a sense favorable to the Democrats and do not allow counterarguments. After all, it is much more convenient and profitable to play the problems of "ordinary" people, especially since they are the vast majority, than to show the real-life in all of its diversity. Besides, the very principle of providing information to increase interest in it requires sensationalism based on artificially inflated conflicts. This is especially evident when a conservative government comes to power. Thanks to Marxist roots, left-wing propaganda opens a favorable field of activity - the average person will always have many unfulfilled needs, and there is nothing easier than to scold the conservatives, convincing the people that only Democrats can defend their interests. To prove that under the capitalist system, the man himself has the opportunity to achieve his goal is a more difficult task. But if the conservative media want to acquire a proper role, they need to increase the number and assertiveness of their national TV stations and other mass-media organizations, which will have a serious fight for the constitutional right to publish their views. The only place to do this now is the Internet.

A special position in arbitrary restrictions on the freedom of speech is taken by lies called political correctness.

This real curse of our time has appeared relatively recently. Interesting in this sense is the telegram sent on 09/01/1945 by the democratic President G. Truman response to the request on this subject from General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz:

*- Political Correctness is a doctrine, recently fostered by a delusional, illogical minority, and promoted by a sick mainstream media, which holds forth the proposition that it is entirely possible to pick up a piece of*

Unfortunately, all this nastiness, thanks to the even wider use of the liberal mass-media, has almost become a law, suppressing any expression of the often-brutal truth and the natural intention to call a spade a spade. Some examples:

America is a great example of inter-ethnic coexistence. Regardless of our skin color, we are all American citizens. So why is it normal to call a white person white and not Euro-American, and why is it necessary to call a black person African-American? Also, it introduces a certain misunderstanding in the relationship between black Americans and actual Africans who come to the United States. And then what should we do about Americans with Asian roots, with some other ones? Don't you feel the idiocy of this usual situation? Does this phrase sound bad: "Next to us was a group of school children of two white and three black teenagers."? The very concept of "white" for someone does not sound correct enough, otherwise, why replace it with the meaningless "Caucasian" in documents containing ethnic issues?

There is a large number of known anti-Patriotic acts, including the burning of the American flag (even by Obama), unwillingness to stand up to greet the national anthem, demonstration hatred to our country as a hotbed of racism, etc. Everyone, of course, knows who has the upper hand in these outrageous actions, but it is taboo to talk about it.

Although this is a clear violation of civil equality before the law - **God forbid that a white** man should do something like this! Again, would the liberal press dare to mention crime statistics for various ethnic groups, even if there could be useful suggestions in such discussion? All these phenomena have the opposite effect, since attempts to conceal them lead to an internal accumulation of cross-racial discontent.

The politically correct representation of Islam as a purely peaceful religion with deliberate masking of its misanthropic foundations is very dangerous (more on this below). This picture is being propagated by Democrats, especially since the time of Obama-Clinton, who fawned over the Muslim world, and who had Islamists in the close to the government circles. The situation in Europe is

even worse. There, in some cities, there are entire Sharia districts where even the police are afraid to show up. They try not to talk about it, as well as about the fact that dozens of white girls were subjected to violence by Arab refugees who are sure of their impunity, because to mention crimes committed by Muslims... Well, how can you?!

In general, political correctness is used in all cases when it is more convenient for liberals to turn a blind eye on the criminal behavior of individual subjects and the entire groups of them. It is almost impossible to talk about a very common phenomenon of “black” racism (only today, some information flashed about the beating of a white boy by a group of black teenagers on a school bus in Florida. <https://maganews2020.org/2019/12/13/shock-video-black-teens-pummel-white-student-over-trump-hat/>)

But talking about white racists - the more, the better, even if it is just nonsense fiction created by someone’s imagination. And to label someone as a “racist” just because this someone does not appeal to you - God himself ordered. If we call a spade a spade, then ANTIFA should be outlawed as an arm-groups of a real fascist organization. Typical of rabid feminists, accusations of sexism (the term that can be adjusted in any way desired) thrown at any of the men, worthy only of an anecdote, rise to the level of a serious problem, as do complaints from LGBT communities about the alleged restriction of their rights. In terms of political correctness, there is nothing worse than being a white, and even more so a man! Of course, the most harmful aspect of political correctness is that it willingly does not identify negative phenomena by their names, does not allow to eliminate them.

## PROBLEMS OF THE FREEDOM OF RELIGION AND ISLAM.

Freedom of religion, especially in recent times, is a controversial concept. When it was introduced as a constitutional norm in the countries of the Western world, the prevailing trends of the Judeo-Christian faith were assumed. With the growing expansion of Islam in these countries, it is necessary to put aside all political correctness and ask the question: “Can these religions coexist at all?”

With the particular importance of this problem, we will discuss it in more detail.

Reading the Koran - the fundamental book of Islam, one can see that its storyline is a compilation of some biblical stories, with the names of the main characters of which simply modified to the Middle-Eastern style. For example, Moses-Musa, Jesus-ISA, etc. And all of them, like Mahomet himself, are prophets. The main difference from the monotheism of Judaism is that the name of the God who gave the Tablets to Moses turns out to be... Allah!

Between the simplified fragments of the gospel are placed the following rules of life according to Mahomed and, as in a song with a repeated chorus, the stories of Paradise after death for the "faithful" and Hell for the rest. The delights of Paradise and the horrors of Hell are described repeatedly with all the power of poetic imagination. It is assumed that life on earth is nothing compared to the heavenly life, which is primarily deserved by those who performed feats in the name of Allah, for example, who killed "infidels". It is interesting that even in the Muslim Paradise, the men will still have an advantage with being "delighted by black-eyed houris", as an option - virgins. Although doesn't it seem strange, what the difference does it make to the disembodied spirit of a man **with** whom to have fun **with**? Well, assume the looks are important, but...

Overall, as you read it, you never stop wondering how such a primitive book could become the basis of one of the most popular religions? On the other hand, if we take into account the limited world-view of the people among whom it was initially spread as a constant repetition of variations of truths allegedly coming from Allah, this could be justified. For the same reason, Islam is spreading much faster than Christianity in Africa.

The poetic nature of the Koran, its fragmentary nature, and variations in the ayahs have always provided ample opportunities for its interpretation, depending on the specific political conditions and the direction of the thoughts of the next Mahdi, Ayatollah, or Imam. Thus, Islam can have a character spreading from relatively peaceful to radically aggressive, not to mention the fact that Muslim trends and countries that have understood it differently still often find themselves in a state of war, for example, Shiites against

Sunnis. Let's note to be fair that there were violent fights between different branches of Christianity as well, but it was mostly during the middle ages, to which the Arab countries gravitate by their way of life.

For a more detailed study of the compatibility of the Muslim and Judeo-Christian religions, we will give the floor to one of the best, in my opinion, sources on Islam, the book by P. P. Tsvetkov's "Jihad in the Koran and life", published in 1912,

HYPERLINK

["http://russianway.rhga.ru/upload/main/19\)%20%D0%9F.%20%D0%9F.%20%D0%A6%D0%B2%D0%B5%D1%82%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B2.pdf"](http://russianway.rhga.ru/upload/main/19)%20%D0%9F.%20%D0%9F.%20%D0%A6%D0%B2%D0%B5%D1%82%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B2.pdf) [http://russianway.rhga.ru/upload/main/19\)%20%D0%9F.%20%D0%9F.%20%D0%A6%D0%B2%D0%B5%D1%82%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B2.pdf"](http://russianway.rhga.ru/upload/main/19)%20%D0%9F.%20%D0%9F.%20%D0%A6%D0%B2%D0%B5%D1%82%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B2.pdf) which provides a comprehensive analysis of the relationship of the first with the second, and the analysis which is true not only for its time, but with some adjustments, today. Here are some excerpts from this book:

How can we explain that many verses, as they were in the vast majority of cases, owed their origin to particular circumstances and therefore have only a limited field of application, and the fact that the Koran is eternal?... Apart from the unity of God, there is no wholeness in this religion: it was pieced together and followed a path that led nowhere.

... **it can be argued** that there is no single faith for all Islamic countries, all Muslims, as well as a single Islamic path, and the society attention is focused on different, often contradictory to each other models. This also applies entirely to the Islamic concept of "Jihad": there is no authority in Islam that can put an end to the dispute as to how the Holy war for faith should be interpreted and carried out.

"Jihad of the sword" is an armed fight against the infidels, in which the fallen are awarded the eternal bliss in Paradise.



The same Sura IX finally contains the declaration of war by Mohamed against Jews and Christians.

“Various prophets,” said Mohamed, “ were sent by God to show his various attributes... However, none of these attributes were sufficient to strengthen the belief, and even the miracles of Moses and Jesus were viewed with distrust. Then I, the last of the prophets, was sent with a sword. Let those who propagate my faith do not enter into arguments or disputes, but kill all who refuse to obey the law. Anyone who fights for the true faith, whether they fall or win, will surely receive a glorious reward.”

The teachings of Jihad are based on Koranic texts and hadiths. The main Koranic text is the following: “Kill the infidels wherever you meet them” (Koran, S IX, v. 5).

Since the first centuries of its existence, Islamism has become primarily a religion of the sword, without which it would hardly ever have become anything other than the Arab heresy of Christianity, interesting to students of religion, but without much significance in the world. With the help of the sword, it became a great political faith, uniting the Middle-East into a homogeneous whole, that is even able to compete with Christianity for the possession of the world.

The great Imam (Abu Hanifa) said: let take gesia (ransom) from all infidels except the Arab infidels, the judgment for whom is the sword or Islam.

According to the hanifath teachings, the relations between Muslims and infidels can only have the character of exclusivity: the normal state is the war with infidels with all its consequences. According to the Addis cited in Hidaya, Muslims must wage the Holy war against infidels until the last day, and infidels do not enjoy the right of inviolability either for themselves or for their property.

These passages are taken from a book written more than a century ago. And what do we see now? On the one hand, considering the economic power of the Western world, from which they have to ask for handouts to help with poverty, some Muslim countries and areas like Palestine are forced to use peaceful and plaintive rhetoric, which is gladly picked up by the liberals of the UN, which has become essentially a platform for Islamic propaganda, including against the United States and Israel. On the other hand, the Koranic **hatred of the infidels**, mixed with pathological envy of their success, has generated a hitherto unseen surge of Islamic terrorism, arousing sympathy in many parts of their aliyah, scattered, thanks to the same “left” tolerance, around the world.

Almost 100 years later, in 2013, an article by I. P. Dobaev and V. I. Nemciny “Holy war in Islam -the essence, the ideology, the political practice.”, <http://www.antiterrortoday.com/glavnaya/konfessionalnye-aspekty/176-svyashchen-naya-vojna-v-islame-sushchnost-ideologiya-politicheskaya-praktika> from the provided fragments of which it is easy to assess the increased danger of Islamic radicalism today.

In the Medina’s surahs of the Koran, the war for the faith is the sacred obligation of the followers of Islam, it is elevated to the rank of fulfilling a divine mission, supported by the authority of Allah: “Let those fight in the way of Allah who buys the next life with the current one! And if anyone fights in the way of Allah and is killed or wins, We will give him a great reward....”Fight in the way of Allah! This is imputed only to you, and you shall encourage the believers... “ (Women, verses 76-78, 86).

“Islam, when it strives for peace, does not mean that cheap peace, the essence of which is only to secure the territory where lives the population that has adopted the Islamic faith. Islam wants the peace under the shadow of which the whole religion would belong to Allah, that is, that people, all people in the shadow of this peace, worship only Allah.”

At the same time, in the late 90s, a prominent theorist and leader of “Al-Jihad”, Ayaman al-Zawahiri, put forward the idea of global Jihad, primarily with the “distant enemy” - the world Kufra Alliance.

Al-Zawahiri writes, “it should not be considered that the struggle for the creation of an Islamic state is a regional war... We must prepare for the fact that this struggle will not be limited to one region, it will be waged both against the internal enemy - apostates and against the external enemy - an Alliance of crusaders and Zionists».

It suggests focusing on the following tasks. “First, we should focus on conducting large-scale actions with a large number of victims, it is the huge losses of human lives that are important. Such actions impress Western society and make people think. This is the only language that the West understands today. Secondly, when conducting combat operations, it is necessary to rely on the actions of the shahids (kamikazes). Such operations do not require large losses on the part of the Muslims but cause great damage to the enemy. “

Al-Zawahiri suggests starting with the simplest and “easiest”: “Kill Americans with bullets, knives, explosives, beat them with metal bars and throw Molotov cocktails at them.”

Despite the Internet links to the mentioned above works, I quote them in some detail **so as not to** cause problems for the reader who does not understand the Russian language in which they are written (assuming subsequent translation into English).

It follows from the stated above that not the entire Muslim religion has a radical bias, but, unfortunately, when dealing with it, it is impossible to separate the fundamentalists from the civilian population, especially since there are no guarantees that, an ordinary Muslim today will not become an Islamic terrorist tomorrow. Too much depends even on the last words of the Mullah at a particular mosque. If a Muslim woman, a member of the American Congress, speaks indifferently about some people who blew something up on 9/11, then where can we place her?

So, can Islam coexist peacefully with the Judeo-Christian religion? If after the information I gave you, you still hesitate with the answer, then ... A fresh fact. The other day, a pilot from Saudi Arabia “friendly” to the United States has shot at the Air Force base, where he was trained, a group of American pilots. This was filmed

by his friends. He was led to this action by the Muslim perception of the West in the spirit of the quote by Al-Zawahiri provided above.

So how many more terrorist attacks are needed for the West to begin to perceive Muslims with adequate caution! I do not have Islamophobia, i.e. an unaccountable fear of Islam. But my observations of its aggressive spread by bribing politicians, the press, and the false propaganda (according to the Koran, Muslims have the right to lie to “infidels”) make me think seriously. Besides, Islamists, when they need to, use the liberal movement for human rights in their defense, as if forgetting about the main human right - to live, which the same Koran denies to “infidels”, including, of course, “left-wing” fools who are already ready to become eunuchs in the European harem for Muslims. Does not all of this point to the need for an amendment to the Constitution that restricts the freedom of this particular religion, along with those forbidden cults, *for which the price of human life is no more than the price of an entrance ticket to Paradise for the “faithful”?*

For this purpose it makes sense to install controlled audio recording devices in the mosques and require law enforcement agencies to monitor individuals who spread fundamentalist views.

In conclusion, about the concept of “freedom”, I want to say that the most important thing is the internal feeling of freedom by a person. If it doesn’t exist, no revolutions will help. Unfortunately, this feeling is not given to many people to experience fully. It can be related to the financial situation when a person has enough money to understand that he is quite well-off to meet his needs within reasonable limits. The less the needs, the easier it is to achieve a sense of freedom. In this sense, there is a certain reverence for the hermits who have turned away from all material goods for the sake of this feeling.

This feeling is natural for people who are immersed in science or art i.e. engaged in the creative search, where nothing can interfere with the free flight of thought. Even if the person is having those thoughts in prison.

But if someone is a slave at heart, which is typical for an average person who subconsciously needs a firm governing power, but vaguely feel the lack of some independence, you can be sure that in

the case of throwing in any slogan, including the words “freedom” and “welfare”, many of them will follow any socialists (even the national-socialist), who would successfully spread it.

### 3. THE DEMOCRATIC BLUFF ABOUT HUMAN EQUALITY. THE FALLACY OF THE APPROACH TO SCHOOL EDUCATION.

The worst situation is with the distortion of the concept of “Equality”. Although from its original definition (see above) it is already clear that it speaks only of the equality of all citizens before the law (hence, in particular, the universal right to vote), but the democrats, socialists, and communists deliberately substitute this for the universal human equality.

I will give you some remarkable thoughts on this subject by the prominent Russian philosopher N. Berdyaev:

“Equality (if it is not the equality defined in legal terms) and freedom are incompatible.”

“Freedom is the right for inequality “

“By nature, people are not equal, equality can only be achieved by violence, and this will always be equality by the” lowest level.”

“The only way to make equal the poor with the rich is to take away the wealth from the rich. You can equalize the stupid with the smart only by turning the brainpower from a virtue to a disadvantage, and so on. A society of universal equality is a society of the poor, weak, and stupid, based on violence.”

Berdyaev wrote this in the early twentieth century. The history of the USSR and other socialist countries built on the proclamation of such equality fully confirmed his thoughts.

And, indeed, in the global community, it is impossible to find two identical people. Even between twins there are differences that

increase with their age. In addition to racial and sexual characteristics, people differ significantly in their intellectual and physical capabilities, in their feelings and character features, etc. THIS is a LAW of NATURE AND it is BEAUTIFUL!

It is necessary to constantly emphasize human individuality, and not try to level it. Why? Because the differences between people lead to the progress of humanity. Remember, why do rivers flow? Because of the level difference between the source and the delta. Without it, the water will turn into stagnant water, a swamp. Where does the current in electrical wires come from? From the difference in voltage potentials. In general, any movement is possible only if there is a potential difference.

In the human community, this role is played by the differences between individuals and their competition on the way to success. The competition between people and their groups is the only key to progress! Without it, the ideal of equality will be the dead in a common cemetery or a semblance of the life of prisoners. Any forced equalization leads to stagnation, but it is the trump card of the left-wing movements: Marxism, communism, socialism, etc., betting on the faceless mass instead of the human person. So, let's not forget the final part of the definition of equality: citizens". have access to all roles, public positions, and occupations. *According to their Abilities...*", i.e. their individual characteristics.

The society should be interested in developing any positive abilities and talents of its members starting with the school. In the US, the opposite situation can be observed. School education is focused on those who are falling behind, not on the leading students, who very quickly lose interest in their classes. Here I have come across the fact that the level of knowledge of high school students is several years behind the corresponding level even in the Soviet school of my time. And this is despite the fact that the number of subjects included in the general curriculum for all schools was almost twice higher than in America! There was a natural desire to be among the best students. The most important thing here (in the US) is not to miss the classes. While my child was in an elementary school, I had met only one teacher who really knew how to teach. As it turned out from our subsequent acquaintance, he received his education in China. By the way, have you noticed that if there are some Chinese children in a class, they are usually among the best students? This is because they are

brought up from early childhood to work hard to achieve the goal. Recently, the results of an international math competition among school students have caught my attention. Chinese high school students were almost four years ahead of their American peers.

The only way out of this situation is to teach children from the beginning of their school life to equality before the law, which for them should be national education programs and the rules of conduct. Privileges can only be provided to handicapped students.

We have to admit that in ordinary schools in the United States, the working of a teacher does not require special professional skills. It is too formal - little attention is paid to explaining the learning material and endless tests on bulky textbooks filled with only a small part of useful information. This presentation of information with a free choice of subjects scares students away from mathematics, physics, and other hard science classes. As a result, when choosing a profession, most people choose a humanitarian bias, despite further problems with finding a job.

School graduates are often not ready for sharply increasing loads in Universities, and the knowledge obtained in schools does not provide a sufficient basis for the cultural development of students who show no clear understanding of the simplest concepts of history, geography, biology, physics, etc. This makes them easy prey to the falsehoods of the mass media, populist politicians, and the far from reality Hollywood fantasies, which only actors, who play them, can believe in, and who do not suffer from excessive intelligence as well. Not all of them, of course!

Let's go back to the end of section III. So, a normal person is characterized by ordinary qualities, such as the desire for success, concern for their lives and loved ones, for their well-being, property, etc., and by the vicious ones, such as cowardice, greed, the ability to steal and to commit other crimes, up to violence and murder. The concentration of some of these individual qualities, as well as common ideas, characterize the behavior of certain groups of people. When Marx refers to the movement of faceless masses of people then, due to the vagueness of the concept of "people", an analogy is suggested with human gatherings, which are seized by the herd behavior, commonly known as "crowd psychology".

What a real herd behavior I had observed once at a collective farm, where I, like other students of universities, was often sent to help the “people’s” agriculture complex. The farm had several large herds of cows that differed in age. There was no problem herding adult “dairy” cows in the meadow. They usually slowly eat the grass around them, can lie down, chewing it, in general, behaving calmly.

Quite a different thing are the “girls” - young, not yet calved, but already ready for this, cows. We called them “Young Communists” among ourselves.

Imagine their herd, about one and a half hundred heifers, rushing, not knowing the path forward, and seeing only the backs of the ones in the front of them. The most difficult task was to make them graze on the correct meadow. To do this, several horse-riding herders have to constantly run around shouting and swearing, trying to get them together. For a while, this can be achieved, and they graze like adult cows. Suddenly, about a dozen heifers burst through the gap between the herders and rush off somewhere. They are followed by the others, and the herders face a difficult task to drive them back, hitting the muzzles of the front ones with sticks (the cows do not belong them, right). Note that a dozen “rebels” were always almost the same cows, which could even be identified by the traces of sticks on their muzzles! Well, doesn’t it remind you some fanatical socialists, instinctively dragging the crowd with them, and what is the most characteristic, they themselves do not understand where.

Of course, the village herders were the last to think about the analogy between the behavior of a herd of cows and the “popular masses”, but for me, who was already familiar with Marxism and reflected on its mistakes, this observation confirmed the idea that the masses, as well as the herd, are driven by similar instincts

For those who find this strange, I will briefly explain. I think that the transmission of thoughts at a distance is a fact that no longer requires proof. The thought is secondary to the instinct that causes it and is much more difficult to transmit, so the impulse of the instinct is transmitted with more energy. To perceive thoughts clearly, you need special abilities that are usually characteristic of the mediums. People with an average level of perception are mainly able to sense the transmission of strong instincts, in contrast to



animals that sense weaker ones (ask owners, whose dogs usually know in advance the command they are going to execute).

Being in a crowd of ordinary people who are excited by someone's (let's call them "leaders") instincts, you involuntarily fall under the influence of the general excitement that charges the space around you. It increases in proportion to the growth of the mass of people who transforms it, and at some point, whether you like it or not, you turn from a person into a part of the crowd, obeying its basic instincts. Perhaps the most understandable example of this is when being among the sports fans in a stadium, you, usually a balanced person, start yelling like a madman along with the others. And later you ask yourself in surprise: "My God, what's gotten into me?" You were simply under the influence of "herd behavior".

Leadership is inherent in the character of some individuals in the form of heightened, sometimes even painful, emotionality. The stronger it is, the more intensely their instinct for a corresponding thought is transmitted to the crowd, even if the words, that express the thought, are lost in the noise. Sometimes this is enhanced by the charisma of the leader.

If such a leader aspires to be in the position of power, the last thing he wants is to share the power with others. It seems to him, with the jealousy characteristic for such people, that his thoughts are what differ favorably from him of the others, even from those who are ideologically close to him. Thoughts of possible competition often give rise to paranoid suspicions. That is why he tries to remove "smart people" from his environment, as well as others who strive to be individuals. Methods? Well, any methods can be used in prisons, exile, execution. The main life wisdom of a layman in such conditions is to keep a low profile, to be like everyone else. This is the main idea of making everybody equal, with which leaders easily turn into dictators - "shepherds", leaving the fate of the "herd" to the mass of the average people. The only way to avoid this is for the society to come to terms with the idea of inequality among its members (not in the legal terms, of course). Under the current situation, sad as it may be, the analogy between the people and the herd will only grow in the long run.

No state governed by a prevailing political force has been able to avoid sliding into some form of the dictatorship. This is what the

left-wing democrats and socialists strive for with their characteristic revolutionary aggressiveness and mass protests, often amounting to the physical violence against dissenters.

Today's democracy is very convenient for them. Voting rights with almost no restrictions lead to the fact that the electorate of the left is constantly growing due to an increase in the number of people relying on social programs of the state. Naturally, they believe that the benefits provided by these programs can and should be as large as possible. Who **else if not** the socialists, who are striving for unlimited power, can promise this against the background of their constantly advertised concern for the people's welfare? They even try to surpass each other with such promises. Look at the latest Democratic Party primaries the Presidential elections, especially since they are going to pay for their promises, if it will come to it, with the taxpayers' money, of which the majority are Republicans.

And the latter, don't they want full power as well? Of course, they want, but it is not in their character to act so aggressively. The majority of them are busy with their own business in a system that can be easily improved evolutionarily, for example through the changes of the tax code. Those for whom working time is a source of income will not waiste it at demonstrations and rallies. However, they feel alarmed when assessing the current political situation, which is still in some balance but shows a trend for the electorate to shift to the left as the result of the natural growth of the unemployed population. The danger lies in the passing over a certain "point of no return"- in which the rapid growth of the left-wing electorate provides sufficient momentum for the slide from democracy to dictatorship or an authoritarian rule, which becomes only a matter of time.

To preserve the political balance, as a guarantee against falling into dictatorship, one of the possible solutions is the introduction of *masts*, according to which the preferential right to vote (as an option - 2/1) should be held by citizens who pay taxes, and, consequently, contribute to the budget and the material base of the country. I can imagine how the Democrats will descend on me with protests in defense of, what can be considered, the main achievement in their history, but I think, that social and economic progress more than justifies such an improvement of the democracy, which is still, as we have noted, far from being the best state

governing systems.

On the other hand, the participation of democratic parties is necessary for political life, since they, in their essence, represent the interests of those segments of society that need social assistance. This assistance depends directly on taxation. At the same time, those who contribute to the economic development of the country and pay the taxes are naturally interested in reducing them, while the needs of the budget require their growth. This is not a simple arithmetic. The most important point is not to slow down the production industry with the taxes, that are too large, up to the point of providing the temporary tax exemption for the new enterprises and their employees.

To avoid a budget deficit, it is necessary not only to stimulate, first of all, those industries that bring the income to the state budget but also to think about a prudent distribution of the budget, including expenditures for the social programs. There is an important subtlety of a balancing act in this, that liberals usually try to avoid in silence. I mean that the social assistance to the able-bodied population should not be larger than that which creates a real need to find a job that provides a meaningful life. The phenomenon, when large families parasitize the children's welfare assistance, is completely meaningless. The birth rate should be regulated based on the proven financial capacity of the family, and it can only be its right.

These measures should help to achieve the maximum labor potential of the country. However, for the achievement of this potential, it is necessary to encourage all high school graduates, who have successfully completed a national school education program, but who need financial assistance, with a sufficient amount of money to receive specialized education, especially in technical areas, and later, possibly on a competitive basis, provide an initial investment to their enterprise.

To discuss economic outlines, at least in the scope of the measures proposed here, some kind of political balance is needed to ensure a competition of ideas in achieving the comprehensive progress of the state.

So, what is after all the modern Western democracy as the state

regime in which we live in? Let's imagine it as a sailing ship that still has some sailing to do. Its skeleton (masts and spars ribs, and other elements of frame) is the constitutional, federal, and local laws. Democracy is the hull covering that has been cleaned, repainted, and patched for many years since its construction, i.e. the revolution that ended the slavery and released the boat to sail FREE. You are the passengers, and the crew are the government employees and agencies headed by the captain - the President. You have to travel in the open sea with all its dangers, including armed attacks, but what you see in front of you is an old, almost defenseless, battered ship. You know that the crew is poorly trained and is not going to follow the orders of the more intelligent members, even for the correct setting of the sails.

Isn't this an unpleasant prospect for the passengers? But you have to go, although there is still some time for troubleshooting. What should be done first? Of course, one should start with the hull (democracy), some additional means of protection, and the crew retraining, so the main recommendations from the last section of the article:

- 1.The electoral system improvement with the introduction on right to vote qualification based on tax contribution.
- 2.Equal freedom of speech for all political forces.
- 3.Unfiltered truth instead of the politically correct lies.
- 4.Prohibition of misogynistic propaganda of Islam.
- 5.Differentiation of individuals as the foundation of sociology.
- 6.School education with an increase in the number of compulsory subjects necessary for cultural development at the high school level, aimed at encouraging the successful students. Textbooks size reduction while increasing their logical and scientific content.